IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.PADMANABHAN NAIR

MONDAY, THE 12TH FEBRUARY 2007 / 23RD MAGHA 1928

WP(C).No. 14915 of 2006(A)

PETITIONER:

SUDHEESH.K.S., AGED 35,
S/O.K.P.SUBRAMANYAN, KIZHKKUNOOTU HOUSE,
ASHTAMICHIRA P.O., THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.G.SREEKUMAR (CHELUR)

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **THE IRINJALAKUDA CO-OPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT BANK LTD. NO.R-312, HEAD OFFICE, IRINJALAKUDA P.O., IRINJALAKUDA-680 121, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.**

2. **THE ASSISTANT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES, MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK, IRINJALAKUDA P.O., THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

3. **THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATION, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

4. **M.M.KRISHNAN, PEON, IRINJALAKUDA CO-OPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT BANK LTD.NO.R-312, IRINJALAKUDA P.O., PIN-680 121.**

BY ADV. SRI.V.G.ARUN
SRI.N.P.SAMUEL
SRI.P.RAVINDRAN
BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.P.K.RAVIKRISHNAN – R2 & R3

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 12/02/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) NO.14915/2006

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1:- COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION CALLING FOR APPLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT DT.26.10.04.

EXT.P2:- COPY OF THE REPORT FURNISHED TO THE PETITIONER BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT CONCERNING THE INTERVIEW DT.12.1.05.

EXT.R1(a):- COPY OF THE RESOLUTION DT.17.1.05.

EXT.R4(a):- COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER DT.17.1.05.

EXT.R4(b):- COPY OF THE ORDER DECLARING MY PROBATION DT.19.5.06.

K.PADMANABHAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C)No. 14915 OF 2006

Dated this the 12th day of February, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner was an applicant to the post of watchman cum peon notified by the 1st respondent bank. The 4th respondent also applied for that post. After conducting the test and interview the bank published the list. The case of the petitioner is that he is entitled to get 2nd rank since he got 2nd place in the written test. But he has given 3rd rank by giving more marks to the 4th respondent for interview. Subsequently, the validity of the list was extended for a period of one year from the date of expiry of the list. That period is also over.

2. The counsel for the respondent bank submits that after the expiry of the period fresh notification was published and test was conducted. It is submitted that the petitioner also appeared for the test . I do not find any reason to interfere with the subsequent selection process which is legal and proper.

Therefore, this writ petition is closed. But I make it clear that I am not expressing any opinion regarding the subsequent selection process.

(K.PADMANABHAN NAIR, JUDGE)

ps